



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/316,899	05/22/1999	DARKO KIROVSKI	MS1-356US	8452

22801 7590 12/31/2001

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

MEISLAHN, DOUGLAS J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2132

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2001

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/316,899

Applicant(s)
Kirovski et al.

Examiner
Douglas Meislahn

Group Art Unit
2132



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Douglas Meislahn (3) _____
(2) Casey Christensen (4) _____

Date of Interview Dec 3, 2001

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy is given to 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: 2 and 3

Identification of prior art discussed:
Levine et al., Adler et al., and Mintzer et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:


Applicant emphasized the inventive aspect of inserting fragile and weak watermarks in different parts of a signal. Applicant specifically differentiated between audible and inaudible audio segments. It was agreed that Mintzer et al. showed both robust and fragile watermarks. The examiner contends that Levine et al. renders obvious robust watermarks in audible segments. During the interview the examiner conceded that it was possible that Adler et al. does not show fragile watermarks in imperceptible segments, although this needs further consideration.

Applicant agrees with examiner's comments with respect to the specification, and prosecution would proceed from there.

(A fuller description of the amendments is necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, THE REPLY MUST BE FILED WITHIN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.


GILBERTO BARRON, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222132



Examiner Note: Yes
Attachment to a sig.

this form unless it is an
action.